

- (D) allowing at least one interaction, if any, to occur;
- (E) selecting for said interaction by transferring said host cells or progeny of said host cells to a selective medium that allows identification of said host cells upon activation of the readout system;
- (F) identifying host cells that contain interacting molecules that activate said readout system on said selective medium;
- (G) identifying at least one member of said pair or complex of interacting molecules.

REMARKS

Pursuant to a telephone interview with the Examiner on January 16, 2003, the Examiner has indicated that the amendments of the previous reply, filed on December 19, 2002, have been entered. Based on the interview, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to address any remaining issues in the claims under consideration.

Applicants have also canceled claims directed to non-elected inventions without prejudice. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims of similar or identical scopes in future applications.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the prior Office Action.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

Claims 1, 2, 4-59, 63-66, and 68-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification allegedly does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make/use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Particularly, the Office Action argues that step (c) combines at least two genetic elements in host cells, neither of which are required to be screened in the host cells in step (b), thus leaving

the host cells with unscreened genetic elements which arbitrarily may activate the read-out system without any interactions as desired in lines 1-2 of claim 1.

Pursuant to the telephone interview with the Examiner, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2 to clarify the subject matter claimed. Applicants submit that there is no narrowing of scope due to these amendments.

Based on the conversation with the Examiner, Applicants believe that such amendments will overcome the rejection on grounds of 35 U.S.C. 112, 1st paragraph. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections. Applicants believe that the claims are now in condition for allowance and early notification to this effect is earnestly solicited. Any questions arising from this submission may be directed to the undersigned at (617) 951-7000.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this submission, please charge the fees to our **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 23, 2003

Customer No: 28120
Docketing Specialist
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050



Yu Lu, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 50,306